APPENDIX E: COMPARISON OF CLAIM 1 OF U.S. PATENT 6,869,605 WITH CLAIMS 195 AND 196 OF THE PRESENT APPLICATION

'605 Patent	Present Application	Why Claims Interfere
1. A method of inhibiting B-cell growth in an animal comprising the step of	195. A method of inhibiting B lymphocytes comprising	The terms "B-cell" and "B lymphocyte" are interchangeable. See, e.g., Janeway, C. & P. Travers. Immunobiology: The Immune System in Health and Disease, (Current Biology Ltd./Garland Publishing, London) 1994; p. 1:8 (legend to Figure 1.7 which uses the terms "B cell" and "B lymphocyte" interchangeably)(Appendix M). Moreover, the equivalence of "B cell" and "B lymphocyte" is readily apparent from reading the '605 Patent. For example, column 18 of the '605 Patent at lines 55-67, particularly lines 55 and 63 refers to "antigen-specific B lymphocytes" and "antigen-specific B cells" interchangeably. Similarly, column 19 of the '605 Patent at lines 1-6, particularly lines 3 and 6, refers to "B lymphocytes" and "B cells" interchangeably.
		As of the earliest effective priority date of either application, it was well known in the art that B lymphocytes, when activated, undergo proliferation (growth) and differentiation (maturation) into antibody producing (immunoglobulin producing) B cells. See, e.g., Janeway, C. & P. Travers. Immunobiology: The Immune System in Health and Disease, (Current Biology Ltd./Garland Publishing, London) 1994; pp. 3:38 and 8:2 (legend to Figure 8.1) (Appendix M); and Abbas, A.K. et al., Cellular and

'605 Patent	Present Application	Why Claims Interfere
		Molecular Immunology, (W.B. Saunders Company, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., Philadelphia) 1991; pp. 187 and 189 (Appendix N). Accordingly, the method of inhibiting B-cell growth recited in Claim 1 of the '605 Patent anticipates or renders obvious the method of inhibiting B lymphocytes recited in Claim 195 of the present application, and vice versa.
administering a therapeutically effective amount	administering an effective amount	The administration of a "therapeutically effective amount" or "effective amount" of the recited antibody is the amount sufficient to achieve the desired result. Determination of a "therapeutically effective amount" or an "effective amount" is within the skill in the art.
of an anti-BAFF antibody that binds human BAFF (SEQ ID NO:1),	of an antibody that binds a protein whose amino acid sequence is: MDDSTEREQS RLTSCLKKRE EMKLKECVSI LPRKESPSVR SSKDGKLLAA TLLLALLSCC LTVVSFYQVA ALQGDLASLR AELQGHHAEK LPAGAGAPKA GLEEAPAVTA GLKIFEPPAP GEGNSSQNSR NKRAVQGPEE TVTQDCLQLI ADSETPTIQK GSYTFVPWLL SFKRGSALEE KENKILVKET GYFFIYGQVL YTDKTYAMGH LIQRKKVHVF GDELSLVTLF RCIQNMPETL PNNSCYSAGI AKLEEGDELQ LAIPRENAQI SLDGDVTFFG ALKLL	The amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 of the '605 Patent is identical to the amino acid sequence recited in Claim 195 of the present application (the Proposed Count). See Appendix O. Accordingly, since the target antigens are identical, the antibody recited in Claim 1 of the '605 Patent and Claim 195 of the present application are the same antibody.
wherein B-cell growth in the animal is inhibited.	wherein B lymphocytes are inhibited.	See above discussion regarding the inhibition of B-cells/lymphocytes.

'605 Patent	Present Application	Why Claims Interfere
		Taken together, the subject matter of Claim 1 of the '605 Patent would, if prior art, have anticipated or rendered obvious the subject matter of Claim 195 of the present application and vice versa. Thus, Claim 1 of the '605 Patent and Claim 195 of the present application are directed to interfering subject matter.

1. A method of inhibiting B-cell growth in an animal comprising the step of	196. A method of inhibiting B lymphocyte proliferation comprising	The terms "B-cell" and "B lymphocyte" are interchangeable. See, e.g., Janeway, C. & P. Travers. Immunobiology: The Immune System in Health and Disease, (Current Biology Ltd./Garland Publishing, London) 1994; p. 1:8 (legend to Figure 1.7 which uses the terms "B cell" and "B lymphocyte" interchangeably)(Appendix M). Moreover, the equivalence of "B cell" and "B lymphocyte" is readily apparent from reading the '605 Patent For example, column 18 of the '605 Patent at lines 55-67, particularly lines 55 and 63 refers to "antigen-specific B lymphocytes" and "antigen-specific B cells" interchangeably. Similarly, column 19 of the '605 Patent at lines 1-6, particularly lines 3 and 6, refers to "B lymphocytes" and "B cells" interchangeably.
		The terms "growth" and "proliferation" are interchangeable. The equivalence of "growth" and "proliferation" is readily apparent from reading the '605 Patent. The

		paragraph bridging columns 17 and 18 of the '605 Patent describes an experiment to test whether BAFF delivers "growth-stimulatory inhibitory signals." The experiment which follows is the results of the "proliferation assay" described at the bottom of column 15 of the '605 Patent. The paragraph bridging columns 17 and 18 of the '605 Patent concludes with "BAFF functioned as a costimulator of B-cell proliferation." (emphasis added). This paragraph makes it clear that B cell "growth" is equivalent to B cell "proliferation."
administering a therapeutically effective amount	administering an effective amount	The administration of a "therapeutically effective amount" or "effective amount" of the recited antibody is the amount sufficient to achieve the desired result. Determination of a "therapeutically
		effective amount" or an "effective amount" is within the skill in the art.
of an anti-BAFF antibody that binds human BAFF (SEQ ID NO:1),	of an antibody that binds Neutrokine alpha (SEQ ID NO:2),	The amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 of the '605 Patent is identical to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 of the present application. See Appendix O. Accordingly, the antibody recited in Claim 1 of the '605 Patent and Claim 196 of the present application are the same antibody.
wherein B-cell growth in the animal is inhibited.	wherein B lymphocyte proliferation is inhibited.	The inhibition of "B-cell growth" is interchangeable with the inhibition of "B lymphocyte proliferation."
		Taken together, the subject matter of Claim 1 of the '605 Patent would, if prior art, have anticipated or rendered obvious the subject matter of Claim 196 of the present

	application and vice versa. Thus, Claim 1 of the '605 Patent and Claim 196 of the present application are directed to interfering subject matter.
--	---